



DOCKET NO.: 13529STUS01U (NORT10-00322)

PATENT

Customer No. 33000

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Steve Nixon, et al.  
Serial No.: 09/735,499  
Filed: December 14, 2000  
For: ENHANCED UNIFIED MESSAGING SYSTEM WITH A  
QUICK VIEW FACILITY  
Group No.: 2173  
Examiner: N. Pillai

**MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**APPEAL BRIEF**

The Appellant has appealed to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences from the decision of the Examiner dated May 17, 2005, finally rejecting Claims 1-20. The Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal on October 17, 2005, which was received by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 21, 2005. The Appellant respectfully submits this brief on appeal with the statutory fee of \$500.00.

01/24/2006 BABRAHA1 00000068 09735499

01 FC:1402

500.00 0P

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

This application is currently owned by Nortel Networks Limited as indicated by an assignment recorded on December 14, 2000, in the Assignment Records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office at Reel 011367, Frame 0225.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no known appeals or interferences that will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this pending appeal.

**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-20 have been rejected pursuant to a final Office Action dated May 17, 2005. Claims 1-20 are presented for appeal. A copy of the claims is provided in Appendix A.

**STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

The Appellant filed an RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION on July 18, 2005, in response to the Office Action dated May 17, 2005. The RESPONSE did not amend the claims. The Examiner responded in an Advisory Action, mailed August 10, 2005, that the RESPONSE did not place the application in condition for allowance.

**SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

Regarding Claim 1, a messaging system has an integrated message notification means. (Application, page 6, lines 18-23). The message notification means includes a memory for storing message status information for messages in the messaging system. (Application, page 3, lines 4-5). The message notification means also includes means for determining, from the stored information, which messages are both new and have not had a notification cleared. (Application, page 10, lines 10-25; Table 1). The message notification means further includes a user interface for presenting a list of message notifications. (Application, page 7, lines 26-28; Figure 1). The notifications in the list are associated with only messages that are both new and have not had a notification cleared. (Application, page 7, lines 24-26). The message notification means permits a user to select from the list a particular message notification for manipulation. (Application, page 7, lines 30-34).

Regarding Claim 14, a method of enhancing a messaging system includes the step of providing a message notification application that is integrated with a messaging application of the messaging system. (Application, page 9, lines 17-20). The method also includes storing message status information for messages in the messaging system. (Application, page 3, lines 4-5). The method further includes determining, from the stored information, which messages are both new and have not had a notification cleared. (Application, page 10, lines 10-25; Table 1). The method also includes the message notification means presenting to a user a list of message notifications. (Application, page 7, lines 26-28; Figure 1). The notifications in the list are associated with only messages that are both new and have not had a notification cleared by way of a user interface. (Application, page 7, lines 24-26; page 8, lines 5-7). The method also includes permitting the user to

select a particular message notification from the list for manipulation. (Application, page 7, lines 30-34).

Regarding Claim 15, a message notification means may be used with one or more messaging systems. (Application, page 3, lines 24-26). The message notification means includes a polling means for polling the messaging system(s) for new messages. (Application, page 11, lines 1-3). The message notification means also includes a memory for storing message status information for messages in the messaging system(s). (Application, page 3, lines 28-30; page 11, lines 13-19). The message status information includes a message notification variable that comprises information for determining whether a notification for the message has been cleared. (Application, page 11, lines 13-17; Table 2). The message notification means further includes a user interface for presenting a list of message notifications. (Application, page 7, lines 26-28; Figure 1). The notifications in the list are associated with only messages that are both new and have not had a notification cleared. (Application, page 7, lines 24-26). The message notification means permits a user to select from the list a particular message notification for manipulation. (Application, page 7, lines 30-34).

Regarding Claim 17, a method provides notifications to a user who has access to one or more messaging systems. (Application, page 4, lines 3-6). The method includes providing a message notification means for use with the messaging system(s). (Application, page 4, lines 6-8). The method also includes the message notification means polling the messaging system(s) for new messages. (Application, page 11, lines 1-3). The method further includes storing message status information for messages in the messaging system(s). (Application, page 3, lines 28-30; page 11, lines 13-19). The method also includes determining, from the stored information, which messages

are both new and have not had a notification cleared. (Application, page 11, lines 13-17; Table 2). The method includes the message notification means presenting a list of message notifications. (Application, page 7, lines 26-28; Figure 1). The notifications in the list are associated with only messages that are both new and have not had a notification cleared by way of a user interface. (Application, page 7, lines 24-26). The method also includes permitting the user to select a particular message notification from the list for manipulation. (Application, page 7, lines 30-34).

Regarding Claim 18, a message notification means may be used with one or more messaging systems. (Application, page 4, lines 17-19). The message notification means includes a receiver for receiving indications from the messaging system(s) regarding the presence of new messages. (Application, page 4, lines 20-22). The message notification means also includes a memory for storing message status information for messages in the messaging system(s). (Application, page 4, lines 22-24). The message notification means further includes means for determining, from the stored information, which messages are both new and have not had a notification cleared. (Application, page 11, lines 13-17; Table 3). The message notification means also includes a user interface for presenting a list of message notifications. (Application, page 7, lines 26-28; Figure 1). The notifications in the list are associated with only messages that are both new and have not had a notification cleared. (Application, page 7, lines 24-26). The message notification means permits a user to select from the list a particular message notification for manipulation. (Application, page 7, lines 30-34).

Regarding Claim 19, a method provides notifications to a user who has access to one or more messaging systems. (Application, page 4, lines 30-33). The method includes providing a message

notification means for use with the messaging system(s). (Application, page 4, lines 33-35). The method also includes the message notification means receiving indications from the messaging system(s) of the presence of new messages. (Application, page 12, lines 10-13). The method further includes storing message status information for messages in the messaging system(s). (Application, page 4, lines 22-24; page 12, line 24, to page 13, line 8). The method also includes determining, from the stored information, which messages are both new and have not had a notification cleared. (Application, page 12, line 24, to page 13, line 8; Table 3). The method includes the message notification means presenting a list of message notifications. (Application, page 7, lines 26-28; Figure 1). The notifications in the list are associated with only messages that are both new and have not had a notification cleared by way of a user interface. (Application, page 7, lines 24-26). The method also includes permitting the user to select a particular message notification from the list for manipulation. (Application, page 7, lines 30-34).

#### **GROUND OF REJECTION**

1. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 12-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,396,513 B1.
2. Claims 3, 6 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,396,513 B1 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,943,055.

**ARGUMENT**

**I. GROUND OF REJECTION #1 (§ 102 REJECTION)**

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 12-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is improper and should be withdrawn.

**A. OVERVIEW**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 12-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,396,513 B1 to Helfman, et al. ("Helfman").

A copy of Helfman is provided in Appendix D.

**B. STANDARD**

A cited prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. MPEP § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single cited prior art reference. MPEP § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

**C. THE HELFMAN REFERENCE**

The Abstract of Helfman describes the automatic sorting of incoming mail into separate mailboxes. The user may rank mailboxes in order of presentation. The user may create alarms that

are triggered when a specified threshold of a measurable characteristic of a mailbox is reached. An interface displays multiple windows, including the content of mail messages, the ranking of mailboxes and the criteria for alarms.

Helfman teaches one embodiment of its invention in an electronic mail system. (Col. 1, line 66, through col. 7, line 28). A separate embodiment of the invention is described for a voice mail system. (Col. 7, line 29, through col. 8, line 53).

Helfman describes grouping mailboxes based upon the presence or absence of unread messages (col. 4, lines 8-11 and 17-23), ranking mailboxes based upon the presence or absence of unread messages (col. 4, lines 24-29), communicating the number of unread messages in a mailbox (col. 5, lines 33-38; Fig 3A), triggering an alarm based upon the number of unread messages in a mailbox (col. 5, lines 39-41; Fig 3A), displaying the first unread message in a mailbox (col. 5, line 66, through col. 6, line 4), and sorting new messages into mailboxes (col. 6, lines 43-47).

Where Helfman teaches an embodiment of the invention for a voice mail system, the system tells the user the number of unread messages. (Col. 8, lines 20-26). The system then identifies each unread voice mail message by playing the caller's name and, if prompted by the user, plays the full message. (Col. 8, lines 27-33). After all unread messages in a mailbox have been dealt with in this way, the system moves on to the next mailbox. (Col. 8, lines 33-35). Thus, Helfman teaches that messages for which the caller's name was played, but for which the full message was not played, are subsequently characterized as unread messages. There is no description in Helfman that any information is stored for a message other than its status as 'read' or 'unread.'



**D. CLAIMS 1, 7, 8, 12-20**

Independent Claims 1, 14, 17, 18 and 19 (and dependent Claims 7, 8, 12, 13 and 16) recite determining from stored message status information which messages in a messaging system are new and for which a notification has not been cleared. With regard to Claims 1, 14, 18 and 19, the Examiner asserts that Helfman discloses a means for determining from the stored message status information which messages in the messaging system are new and for which a notification has not been cleared, citing column 1, lines 11-17. (Office Action mailed May 17, 2005, Section 1, second paragraph, lines 4-6). In the cited passage, Helfman teaches that, if new messages are found when a user logs on, the e-mail system displays a notice that the user has new mail. Based upon this teaching, the Examiner argues that merely checking for the presence of new e-mail discloses the means for “determining the clear status of an email.” (Office Action mailed May 17, 2005, Section 1, second paragraph, lines 6-7).

Independent Claims 1, 14, 17, 18 and 19 do not recite determining which messages have a “clear status.” Rather, the claims recite determining which messages have two specific characteristics. First, the messages must be new. Second, the messages must also not have had a notification cleared. Thus, the assertion that Helfman teaches “determining the clear status of an email” does not address the recited limitations of independent Claims 1, 14, 17, 18 and 19. Furthermore, while Helfman teaches an e-mail system with the conventional capability of identifying which messages are unread (or new) and which have been read, Helfman does not describe a system with the capability of determining which messages are both new and have not had a notification cleared, as recited in Claims 1, 14, 17, 18 and 19.

Independent Claim 15 (and dependent Claim 20) recites a memory that stores message status information for messages in one or more messaging systems, including information for each message regarding whether a notification has been cleared. With regard to Claim 15, the Examiner similarly asserts that Helfman discloses a variable for each message that is used for determining whether a notification has been cleared, “wherein the variable check is made for whether the email has been previously accessed by the user,” again citing column 1, lines 15-17. (Office Action mailed May 17, 2005, page 3, last paragraph, lines 5-8). Thus, the Examiner appears to merge access by the user with a variable for determining whether a notification has been cleared. As in independent Claims 1, 14, 17, 18 and 19, the characteristic of a message having had a notification cleared is different than the characteristic of having been accessed by the user, i.e., being new.

With respect to independent Claims 1, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 19, the Office Action further argues that “Helfman discloses a user interface for providing to a user a list of message notifications associated only with those messages determined to be new messages from which a notification has not been cleared” citing column 5, lines 32-37. (Office Action mailed May 17, 2005, Section 1, second paragraph, lines 7-10). For ease of reference, Appellant sets forth below the cited passage:

Window 40 contains (1) a column 47 indicating the names of the mailboxes; (2) a column 49 indicating both the number of unread messages, and the total number of messages, within each mailbox; (3) a column 52 indicating the time/date stamp of the oldest unread message; (4) two columns labeled 55. (Helfman, Col. 5, lines 32-37)

Clearly, no list of message notifications is described in the cited passage — there is described only information about mailboxes: the names of mailboxes, the total number of messages and the number of unread messages in each mailbox, and date/stamp information about the single oldest message in

each respective mailbox. As such, the cited passage describes a list of mailboxes, not a list of message notifications, as recited in the claims.

The Examiner further asserts, “Helfman refers to unread and new messages and in addition to total messages present, wherein these total messages are nonetheless associated with these new messages.” (Office Action mailed May 17, 2005, Section 1, second paragraph, lines 10-12). Here again, the Examiner seems to have found in Helfman’s teaching of the single characteristic of whether a message is new, the two recited limitations of the Appellant’s claims: whether a message is new and whether it has had a notification cleared.

For these reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish that Helfman anticipates all elements of independent Claims 1, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 19 (and their dependent claims). Accordingly, the Appellant respectfully requests that the final rejection of Claims 1, 7, 8 and 12-20 be withdrawn and that Claims 1, 7, 8 and 12-20 be passed to allowance.

**E. CLAIM 2**

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1 and is patentable due to its dependence from an allowable base claim and in light of its own recitations. Claim 2 recites that a selected notification may be manipulated by selecting a functionality associated with a plurality of options presented to a user of the claimed messaging system.

The Examiner asserts that Helfman discloses selecting a functionality associated with a plurality of options presented to the user at column 3, lines 12-16. (Office Action mailed May 17,

2005, page 3, first paragraph). The cited passage (reproduced here with its prefatory language) states:

However, the general steps in establishing a mailbox are the following:

(1) The user assigns a name to the mailboxes ("Boss" and "General" in this example).

(2) The user specifies the fields in the incoming messages which are to be searched, for sorting the messages into their respective mailboxes. (Helfman, col. 3, lines 12-16).

As described with regard to independent Claim 1, Helfman teaches a user interface displaying a list of mailboxes, rather than a list of notifications. Similarly, here the Examiner is citing a description of steps in establishing a mailbox, rather than options presented to a user for manipulating a message notification.

For these reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish that Helfman anticipates all elements of Claim 2. Accordingly, the Appellant respectfully requests that the final rejection of Claim 2 be withdrawn and that Claim 2 be passed to allowance.

**F. CLAIMS 4 AND 5**

Claims 4 and 5 depend from Claim 1 and are patentable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim and in light of their own recitations. For example, Claim 4 recites a messaging system that is a unified messaging system, and Claim 5 recites such a unified messaging system that includes a filtering means enabling a user to select the types of messages to be included in the recited list of message notifications.

A unified messaging system manages different types of messages sent to a particular user, such as voice, facsimile, electronic mail, video or data messages. (Application, page 1, lines 14-21). The Examiner asserts that Helfman teaches a unified messaging system in column 1, lines 5-10. (Office Action mailed May 17, 2005, page 3, second paragraph). The cited passage states: "A common type of electronic mail ("e-mail") system takes the form of one, or more, computer programs running on a server, which also runs other application programs, such as word-processing, spreadsheet, high-level language compilers, etc." Furthermore, Helfman describes a separate embodiment of its invention in a voice mail system. (Helfman, col. 7, line 29, through col. 8, line 53). Thus, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Helfman actually teaches separate systems for managing e-mail messages and voice mail messages, rather than a unified messaging system handling both types of message, as recited in Claim 4.

Similarly, in rejecting Claim 5, the Examiner asserts that Helfman discloses a filtering means for enabling a user to select which types of messages in a unified messaging system are included in the recited list of message notifications, citing column 3, lines 12-55. (Office Action mailed May 17, 2005, page 3, third paragraph). As described with respect to Claim 2, the cited passage actually describes the establishment of mailboxes and the actions of the Helfman system in sorting messages into mailboxes according to criteria established by the user. If a filtering means is in fact described in Helfman, it is clearly a means for filtering e-mail messages in an e-mail system, or voice mail messages in a voice mail system, into mailboxes. Helfman does not teach selecting types of messages, such as voice, facsimile, electronic mail, video or data messages, in a unified messaging system for inclusion in a list of message notifications.

For these reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish that Helfman anticipates all elements of Claims 4 and 5. Accordingly, the Appellant respectfully requests that the final rejection of Claims 4 and 5 be withdrawn and that Claims 4 and 5 be passed to allowance.

## II. GROUND OF REJECTION #2 (§ 103 REJECTION)

The rejection of Claims 3, 6 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

### A. OVERVIEW

Claims 3, 6 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helfman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,943,055 to Sylvan ("Sylvan").

A copy of Sylvan is provided in Appendix D.

### B. STANDARD

In *ex parte* examination of patent applications, the Patent Office bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. (*MPEP* § 2142; *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1262, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992)). The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention is always upon the Patent Office. (*MPEP* § 2142; *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 U.S.P.Q. 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). Only when a *prima facie* case of obviousness

is established does the burden shift to the Appellant to produce evidence of nonobviousness. (*MPEP* § 2142; *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). If the Patent Office does not produce a *prima facie* case of unpatentability, then without more the Appellant is entitled to grant of a patent. (*In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Grabiak*, 769 F.2d 729, 733, 226 U.S.P.Q. 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. (*In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Appellant's disclosure. (*MPEP* § 2142).

### C. THE SYLVAN REFERENCE

Sylvan describes a system for processing and presenting information at a telephone station. (Col. 1, lines 15-18). The Sylvan system provides a user with an incoming mail service. (Col. 6, lines 52-54). Sylvan recites that only the following stored information is presented to the user for

each message: type of mail, name of sender, date and time of receipt, and originating telephone number. (Col. 6, lines 59-62). Sylvan also presents its user with a list of all received mail messages. (Sylvan, Col. 4, lines 53-56).

**D. CLAIMS 3, 6 AND 9-11**

Claims 3, 6 and 9-11 depend from Claim 1. As shown above, Claim 1 is patentable. As a result, Claims 3, 6 and 9-11 are patentable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim.

Sylvan does not and cannot supply the deficiencies of Helfman that have been previously pointed out by the Appellant. The interface of Sylvan provides the user with a list of all messages in the messaging system, rather than a list of message notifications associated with only those messages determined to be new and for which a notification has not been cleared, as recited in Claims 3, 6 and 9-11. (Sylvan, Col. 4, lines 53-56). Indeed, Sylvan does not describe storing message status information that would allow the incoming mail service to determine which messages have not had a notification cleared, as also recited in Claims 3, 6 and 9-11. As such Helfman and Sylvan, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 3, 6 and 9-11.

Accordingly, the Appellants respectfully request that the § 103 rejection of Claims 3, 6 and 9-11 be withdrawn and that Claims 3, 6 and 9-11 be passed to allowance.



**SUMMARY**

The Appellant has demonstrated that the present invention as claimed is clearly distinguishable over the prior art cited of record. Therefore, the Appellant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the final rejection of the Examiner and instruct the Examiner to issue a notice of allowance of all claims.

The Appellant has enclosed a check in the amount of \$340.00 to cover the cost of this Appeal Brief. The Appellant does not believe that any additional fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees (including any extension of time fees) or credit any overpayments to Davis Munck Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: 1/20/2006

  
Robert D. McCutcheon  
Registration No. 38,717

P.O. Box 802432  
Dallas, Texas 75380  
(972) 628-3632 (direct dial)  
(972) 628-3600 (main number)  
(972) 628-3616 (fax)  
E-mail: [rmccutcheon@davismunck.com](mailto:rmccutcheon@davismunck.com)



APPENDIX A

PENDING CLAIMS

1. A messaging system having integrated therewith a message notification means, said message notification means comprising:  
memory means for storing message status information for messages in said messaging system;  
means for determining from the stored message status information which messages in said messaging system are new and for which a notification has not been cleared;  
a user interface for providing to a user a list of message notifications associated with only those messages determined to be new and for which a notification has not been cleared;  
said message notification means permitting the user to select a particular notification from said list for manipulation.
2. A messaging system according to claim 1 wherein said manipulation consists of selecting a functionality associated with a plurality of options presented to the user.
3. A messaging system according to claim 2 wherein said plurality of options is presented visually by a plurality of buttons.
4. A messaging system according to claim 1 wherein said messaging system is a unified messaging system.
5. A messaging system according to claim 4 further comprising a filtering means for enabling said user to select which types of messages are to be included in said list.
6. A messaging system according to claim 5 wherein said user interface is a graphical user interface and wherein different icons are displayed beside different types of messages in said list.
7. A messaging system according to claim 1 wherein said manipulation consists of clearing said particular notification.
8. A messaging system according to claim 1 wherein said manipulation consists of clearing all notifications in said list.
9. A messaging system according to claim 2 wherein said functionality is selected from the group of: clear item, clear all, call sender, open, open messaging application, and print.

10. A messaging system according to claim 9 wherein said open messaging application functionality launches a messaging application associated with said messaging system.

11. A messaging system according to claim 9 wherein said call sender functionality replies to the sender of the selected message notification without retrieving the message itself.

12. A messaging system according to claim 1 wherein said integrated message notification means may be launched from within a messaging application associated with said messaging system.

13. A messaging system according to claim 1 wherein said integrated message notification means is designated as a particular view within a messaging application associated with said messaging system.

14. A method of enhancing a messaging system, said method comprising the steps of:  
providing a message notification application integrated with a messaging application of said messaging system;  
storing message status information for messages in said messaging system;  
determining from the stored message status information which messages in said messaging system are new and for which a notification has not been cleared;  
presenting, to a user by said message notification means, a list of message notifications associated with only those messages determined to be new and for which a notification has not been cleared via a user interface; and  
permitting said user to select a particular message notification from said list for manipulation.

15. A message notification means for use with one or more messaging systems, said message notification means comprising:  
polling means for polling said one or more messaging systems for new messages;  
memory means for storing message status information for messages in said one or more messaging systems, said message status information comprising a message notification variable for each message, said variable comprising information for determining whether a notification has been cleared;  
a user interface for providing to a user a list of message notifications associated with only those messages that are new and for which a notification has not been cleared;  
said message notification means permitting the user to select a particular notification from said list for manipulation.

16. A message notification means according to claim 15 wherein said variable comprises information relating to date, time and sequence of each message.

17. A method of providing message notifications to a user, said user having access to one or more messaging systems, said method comprising the steps of:  
providing a message notification means for use with said one or more messaging systems;  
polling said one or more messaging systems, by said message notification means, for new messages;  
storing message status information for messages in said messaging system;  
determining from the stored message status information which messages in said messaging system are new and for which a notification has not been cleared;  
presenting, to a user by said message notification means, a list of message notifications associated with only those messages determined to be new and for which a notification has not been cleared via a user interface; and  
permitting said user to select a particular message notification from said list for manipulation.

18. A message notification means for use with one or more messaging systems, said message notification means comprising:  
receiving means for receiving indications from said one or more messaging systems regarding the presence of new messages therein;  
memory means for storing message status information for each message in said messaging system;  
means for determining from the stored message status information which messages in said messaging system are new and for which a notification has not been cleared;  
a user interface for providing to a user a list of message notifications associated with only those messages determined to be new and for which a notification has not been cleared;  
said message notification means permitting the user to select a particular notification from said list for manipulation.

19. A method of providing message notifications to a user, said user having access to one or more messaging systems, said method comprising the steps of:  
providing a message notification means for use with said one or more messaging systems;  
receiving, at a receiving means within said message notification means, indications from said one or more messaging systems regarding the presence of new messages therein;  
storing message status information for messages in said messaging system;  
determining from the stored message status information which messages in said messaging system are new and for which a notification has not been cleared;  
presenting, to a user by said message notification means, a list of message notifications associated with only those messages determined to be new and for which a notification has not been cleared via a user interface; and  
permitting said user to select a particular message notification from said list for manipulation.

20. A message notification means according to claim 15 further comprising:  
means for enabling said user to select which types of messages are to be included in the  
notification list.

**APPENDIX B**

**EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

None

DOCKET NO. 13529STUS01U (NORT10-00322)  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/735,499  
PATENT

**APPENDIX C**

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

None

**APPENDIX D**

**PRIOR ART APPENDIX**

**Helfman Reference**

U.S. Patent No. 6,393,513 B1

**Sylvan Reference**

U.S. Patent No. 5,943,055